

**State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Committee**  
**Wednesday, March 25, 2015**  
**Early On® Training and Technical Assistance**  
**240 S. Bridge St. Suite 250**  
**DeWitt, MI 48820**

**9:00-12:00**

**Minutes**

**Participants:** Clare Brick, Christy Callahan, Kristina Donaldson, Melissa Epstein, Laura Goldthwait, Charo Hulleza, Kelly Hurshe, Chandra Jones, Allan Knapp, Sandee Koski, Tiffany Kostelec, Denise Ludwig, Mary Mackrain, Cheryl Najm, Carrie O'Connor, Colleen O'Connor, Barb Schinderle, Nicole Skrabis, Nancy Surbrook, Vanessa Winborne

**Purpose for today's meeting:**

- To share report with the SSIP Committee and bring everyone up to date on the work of Phase I
- To discuss next steps for Phase II
- To thank everyone for their contributions

**Welcome/Introductions**

Everyone was introduced and welcomed. The minutes and agenda were approved.

**Core Team Update:**

The Core team met multiple times since the last meeting to determine the criteria for selecting target service areas as well as to determine which service areas to invite to participate. Charo and Luna from Wayne State University (WSU) worked with the Core team to review data. The following data were taken into consideration:

- Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 3a, Summary Statement 2
- APR Indicator 3a, Summary Statement 1
- APR Indicators 3b and 3c
- Child Outcome Summary (COS) reporting rate
- APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8
- Trend data through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)
- Peer group size
- Geographic location
- Percent of children in Michigan Mandatory Special Education (MMSE)
- Percent of African American children
- Data system orderliness
- Child Outcomes training participation
- DECA-I/T training
- Social Emotional Webinar series participation
- Book Study participation

- Pathways to Potential involvement

Based on all of the data reviewed, the Core team selected the following sites for piloting the improvement strategies: Kalamazoo, Kent, Macomb, Marquette-Alger, and Wexford-Missaukee. Wexford-Missaukee declined to participate.

Service areas that performed high in the same data categories will be studied to see what is going well for them and what they are doing to have positive outcomes for children. These “Achiever” sites will be determined during Phase II. WSU has already done the analysis for the Core team.

In working with the pilots, the first year (Phase II) will be spent doing qualitative data gathering with each site. There will be a team (MDE, WSU, *Early On* Training & Technical Assistance (EOT&TA), local personnel) established to work with the service areas and do some discovery work to find out how their systems work.

The second year (Phase III) will be initial implementation.

### **Target setting for service areas**

Charo shared the presentation titled, “Projected Improvement for Selected Target Areas.” Several members expressed concern over the proposed targets. Dialogue took place for two hours and everyone weighed in on their thoughts around the targets. Some highlights were:

- It’s hard to set targets when it’s not certain what intervention will happen to raise outcomes.
- This is the first year the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) will be looking at the Results Indicators. A rating from the federal government less than meets requirements may be detrimental to *Early On* in many areas.
- There has been remarkable improvement in areas using the Home Visiting model where quality improvement activities have been embedded. Data have shown gains after just a few months of intervention.
- When successful intervention is occurring in the targeted service areas, it could be scaled up much sooner than 2018, which would improve the ripple effect for the rest of the state. Webinars, newsletters, training, and presentations at conferences could be done to share information as soon as we can. The opportunities are not just with those four target areas. In order to realize a more modest increase with state improvement there should be more rigorous improvement goals for the other 52 service areas.

Charo noted that for FFY13 18 of 56 service areas reported 70 percent or above for Indicator 3a, Summary Statement 2. About half (29) met the 2018 target already, between 62.5-100 percent. There is a good distribution of service areas among the high achievers.

The committee was in agreement that none of the pilot service areas should have targets above the state target for Indicator 3a, Summary Statement 2. Therefore,

the targets were lowered for Kent and Marquette-Alger to remain in line with the state target. The targets were not changed for Macomb and Kalamazoo.

The final targets are:

Baseline data 2013	Target 2014	Target 2015	Target 2016	Target 2017	Target 2018
40.4%	38.0%	40.0%	42.9%	46.3%	51.6%

Broken down by service area, the targets are:

	FFY2013 Ind 3 actual exit COS submitted (Ind 3A-SS2 denominator)		FFY 2013	Ind 3A- SS2 Results	Projected Ind 3A- SS2 Results	Projected Ind 3A- SS2 Results	Projected Ind 3A- SS2 Results	Projected Ind 3A- SS2 Results	Projected Ind 3A- SS2 Results
				FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
<b>Across 4 Target Areas</b>	<b>915</b>	Percent share across 4 areas (weights)	<b>370</b>	<b>40.4%</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>51.6%</b>
<b>Macomb</b>	366	40.0%	89	24.3%	21.0%	24.0%	28.0%	33.0%	41.0%
<b>Kalamazoo</b>	73	8.0%	18	24.7%	23.0%	26.0%	30.0%	35.0%	43.0%
<b>Kent</b>	449	49.1%	248	55.2%	53.2%	54.2%	56.2%	58.2%	60.9%
<b>Marquette- Alger</b>	27	3.0%	15	55.6%	54.6%	55.6%	56.6%	58.6%	60.9%

## SSIP Report

The committee briefly reviewed the report.

## SSIP Phase II

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will be in touch regarding phase II.

## Round of Words

- Appreciating flexibility
- In awe of different perspectives and people willing to share
- Challenged, being involved challenges me as coordinator
- Thoughtful
- Appreciation to Barb for leading us through this process
- Reasonable
- Appreciative of the process and respect for one another and our perspectives
- Gratitude
- Grateful and thankful for everyone
- We have engaged stakeholders
- Excitement
- Impressed with how well everyone shared their own perspectives and how respectful everyone was about disagreeing and how we landed in one place together

- Convolutd but hopeful
- Informative, I've learned so much at these meetings
- Grateful and appreciative that there has been a consistent family/parent voice
- Productive
- Endurance—everyone is very tolerant
- Productive
- Shows importance of having different minds and perspectives around table
- Love the respectful dialog and very hopeful for the work